

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview granted March 2. During that interview, and also in the Advisory Action, the Examiner suggested to amend the claims to recite that the service computer is a maintenance and diagnostics service computer which performs maintenance and diagnostics on the printing or copying system. Applicant has decided to accept the Examiner's suggestion and therefore the claims presented herein now recite a maintenance and diagnostics service computer which performs maintenance and diagnostics on the printing or copying system. This language is fully supported by Applicant's Substitute Specification at page 1, lines 16-18 and page 5, lines 23-25.

The Examiner agreed during the telephone conference that such language distinguishes over Wu since in Wu Figure 1 the sender, which the Examiner indicated he was analyzing to be the service computer, sends print information to a printer 104 through server 2 which the Examiner has analogized to be the control unit. But the sender print information to a printer is not performing maintenance and diagnostics on a printer with a maintenance and diagnostics service computer. There is no hint anywhere in Wu of performing maintenance and diagnostics. This is a very significant difference because with Applicant's method of claim 53 it is important that the system control unit, as recited in the last four lines of the claim, verifies authenticity of the maintenance and diagnostics service computer so that the system control unit can properly maintain security for the printing or copying system which is to be maintained and diagnosed.

There are additional differences between claim 53 and the Wu reference. During the telephone interview, the Examiner indicated that he was analyzing in Figure 1 the sender as being the service computer, the server 1 as the

authentication server, and the server 2 as the control unit of the printer. However, claim 53 recites generating a transaction information by an authentication server and delivering the transaction information to a user of said maintenance and diagnostics service computer, the transaction information being entered by the user of the service computer into the service computer in order to execute authentication of the service computer. Nowhere in Figure 1 or in the remainder of Wu does the server 1 generate a transaction information and deliver that transaction information to the sender in Figure 1; and more particularly there is no suggestion of the sender in Figure 1 of Wu generating first data including a hardware identifier of hardware contained in the sender computer and transmitting that hardware identifier from the sender to the server 1.

Also, claim 53 distinguishes by reciting generating key data by the authentication server depending on the first data which includes the hardware identifier of hardware. But the server 1 in Fig. 1 does not generate such key data depending on first data which includes a hardware identifier of hardware contained in the sender.

Thus for all of the above reasons, claim 53 readily distinguishes over Wu.

Dependent claims 54-66 are allowable at least for the reasons independent claim 53 is allowable and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

System claim 67 has been amended in a fashion similar to claim 53 and also distinguishes for the reasons noted with respect to claim 53.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 27,841)

Brett A. Valiquet
Schiff Hardin LLP
Patent Department
Suite 6600
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 258-5786
Attorneys for Applicants.
CUSTOMER NO. 26574

CH2\8524316.1